



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| 08/882,415 | 06/25/97 | ZHANG | S MIT-7762 |

HM42/0830
DAVID E. BROOK, HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH &
P.C.
TWO MILITIA DRIVE
LEXINGTON MA 02421-4799

EXAMINER

GARCIA, M

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

1627

26

DATE MAILED:

08/30/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Interview Summary

Application No.
08/882,415

Applicant(s)
Zhang et al

Examiner
Maurie E. Garcia, Ph. D.

Group Art Unit
1627



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Maurie E. Garcia, Ph. D.

(3) _____

(2) Steve Davis

(4) _____

Date of Interview Aug 28, 2001

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 5, 7, and 13-15

Identification of prior art discussed:
N/A

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) N/A

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Interview was a continuation of an interview conducted on August 16, 2001.


Discussed proposed claims. The examiner stated that the proposed claims do not correspond to claims 5, 7 and 13-15 (rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims) but instead incorporate different combinations of limitations. The evaluation of allowability was based on the current chain of dependencies in the instant case. The proposed claims raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search and do not materially reduce or simplify the issues in the instant case.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


MAURIE E. GARCIA, PH. D.
PATENT EXAMINER
ART UNIT 1627